UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,481 07/18/2003		Jong Lim	015662-002100US	4558
22918 PERKINS COI	7590 04/30/200 E LLP		EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 2168			YOUNG, MICAH PAUL	
MENLO PARK, CA 94026			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/623,481	LIM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	MICAH-PAUL YOUNG	1618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 12 March 2008. A brief date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	ny extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37	7(e)), to avoid dismiss	al of the appeal.
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the properties of the appear of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the properties of t	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); w); ter form for appeal by materially rec corresponding number of finally reje	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying t	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.14. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving the second seco	21. See attached Notice of Non-Col: lowable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-46. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary. 1. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered to the affidavit or other evidence failed to other evidence filed after the date of filing entered to other evidence filed after the date of filing entered to other evidence filed after the date of filing entered to other evidence filed after the date of filing entered to other evidence filed after the date of filing entered to other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea , and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been consideration.		•	
because: See Continuation Sheet.		and in condition for t	2.1.5 11 41 100
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618			

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has amended the claims to recite that the polymeric film is derived from a polymer effective to prevent adhesion or interaction between the drugs, however the claims are identical to those of the prior art. The polyvinyl alcohol polymers of the prior art would inherently meet this limitation. Further the new limitations might raise 112 issues if the polyvinyl alcohol of the prior art does not meet the limitations of claims 1 and 2, the scope of the claims now comes into question.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has amended the claims to recite that the polymer dissolves in gastrointestinal fluid and is derived from a polymer prevents interaction of the drugs, however these polymers are identical to the polyvinyl alcohol of the prior art. Since the same polymers are used, they must also have the same drug interaction and dissolution properties. For these reasons the claims remain rejected.